



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE HISTORY OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

MR. HORE¹ entitles his work a "Student's History of the Greek Church," which means a concise outline of the leading events and a delineation of the chief actors in the drama of eastern Christianity. The last 150 pages out of the 514 of which the work consists are an account of the Russian church; and the author does well to enter so fully into the history of Slavonic Christianity, for all will agree with him that "the conversion of Russia is the greatest conquest which the Christian church has ever made since the time of the apostles."

In his preface, indeed, Mr. Hore avows that the object of his book is chiefly political, namely, to take his share in making Russia and England friends by promoting a union of the two national churches. Happily he keeps this his object well in the background throughout the book, for had it been allowed to color and shape the narrative, the author would have revealed himself a pamphleteer rather than a historian condensing into five hundred pages an enormous amount of records and much multifarious learning. Perhaps the fault of the book is that it gets in so much and seeks to leave out no event, no dates, and no names. Its pages, packed with cut-and-dried information, often read somewhat jejune. It would have been better to omit some of this, and to use the space economized for broader and ampler characterization of great spiritual movements. Thus the Manichean and Paulician churches are barely mentioned, although in a negative manner they contributed so largely to the shaping of orthodox opinion and ritual.

Mr. Hore recognizes that "the schism which followed the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon was as much political as religious, and was not merely a revolt of churches from the orthodox church, but of whole nations from the Roman empire." Here he enunciates a valuable truth which deserves to have been unfolded more fully as the key to an understanding of the Christian religion, not only in the East, but in the West. He also deplores "the ultra-dogmatism and narrow-mindedness of those early days," with which the church "cut off from the Sacraments all that rejected the watchwords of Councils." Would that it had been confined to early days! We today are witnesses of Tolstoy's excommunication by the Russian church, and of the excommunication of the entire Bulgarian church by the Greek patriarch of

¹ *The Student's History of the Greek Church.* By REV. A. H. HORE. London and Oxford: James Parker, 1902. 514 pages. \$2.25.

Constantinople. As long as this old spirit of intolerance and futility endures in eastern Christianity, it is unlikely that the mass of English churchmen will share Mr. Hore's zeal for a reunion therewith.

The introductory chapter, on some characteristics of the Greek church, is well written and full of information, as indeed is the whole volume; and the author, who has read the Greek sources with evident care, adds copious references to them at the foot of each page, so giving the student authority for each important statement. The chapters on the Russian church depend less directly on original authorities.

In a book so packed with information there must needs be several errors, but they mostly affect small points. Such is the statement, on p. 226, that the Armenian church recognizes as canonical the History of Joseph and Asenath, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the forged correspondence of the Corinthians and Paul. Mr. Hore's book is to be recommended to students, and forms a useful supplement to the works of Finlay and Gibbon.

The translator of the book of Kyriakos² tells us in his preface that the author of this work has been for thirty years professor of church history in the University of Athens. The translation is made from the second edition, published in Modern Greek in 1898. He claims that Professor Kyriakos is the first writer of the nineteenth century to give us a critical and systematic history of the fortunes of the eastern, and especially of the Greek, churches since the fall of Constantinople. This praise seems well deserved, and Professor Kyriakos is to be thanked all the more because at the head of each chapter he adds a list of books, both in Greek and in the other tongues of Europe, in which we shall find information about the matters he treats of. The work falls into four parts, dealing with (1) "The History of the Orthodox Church as in Subjection to the Turks;" (2) "The Rise and Growth of the Free Orthodox Church of Emancipated Hellas;" (3) "The Russian Church;" and (4) "The Minor Churches, Nestorian, Monophysite, Jacobite, Coptic, Maronite, and Armenian, that Survive in the East." The first two parts contain most that is new and will be read with much interest; for, as the translator notes in his preface, these pages throw much welcome light on the disturbances now rife in Macedonia and Bulgaria, on the attitude of the oriental churches toward Islam, and on the eastern policy of Russia.

² *Geschichte der orientalischen Kirchen von 1453-1898*. Von A. DIOMEDES KYRIAKOS. Autorisierte Uebersetzung von ERWIN RAUSCH. Leipzig: Deichert, 1902. 290 pages. M. 4.

Let us epitomize what we learn from Professor Kyriakos about the first of these topics. The conquest of Constantinople, instead of diminishing, increased the power and prerogatives of the Byzantine patriarch and of the higher clergy. For in the Byzantine polity the clergy were kept under by the emperor, and the administration of the church was frankly Erastian. But the Mohammedan rulers felt their inability to understand and control the clergy, and found it conducive to peace and quiet to give the patriarch the power of a policeman and hold him responsible for the good behavior of his flock. Moreover, after the disappearance of the Christian emperor, what was left of Greek or Christian national sentiment tended to crystallize around the figure of the patriarch, just as in Armenia, after the destruction of the Arsacid dynasty in the fifth century, the *Catholicos* or patriarch became the representative of the national memories and aspirations, and still continues to be so. Not only did the early sultans leave the church synods in enjoyment of their rights, but the bishops, exempted from taxation, received a large jurisdiction in disputes between Christians, and the government only intervened to execute sentences pronounced by the ecclesiastics. The worst infringements of Christian rights followed later in the turning of the churches into mosques and the robbery of Christian children to recruit the corps of Janizaries.

It has been at the hands of the Christian nations, which have one after the other freed themselves from the Mohammedan yoke, that the patriarchs of Constantinople have seen their ecumenical prestige suffer most. In 1453 the Russians began to choose their own patriarchs instead of taking one chosen at Constantinople; but the patriarchs so chosen continued to seek their ratification at Constantinople till 1657, when the last shadow of dependence on the Byzantine was abolished. Professor Kyriakos has no fault to find. He writes:

So long as Russia was a barbarous country, dependence of its church on Constantinople was a blessing; but so soon as the country began to develop it was right and canonical that the Russian realm should supplement its political independence with ecclesiastical independence.

The Russian patriarchs retained a full control of their church, until Peter the Great two centuries ago substituted for their authority a synod of bishops acting under the eye and superintendence of a layman nominated by the Tzar. Peter also abolished all the monasteries but a few, which he reformed, and put a stop to unnecessary ordinations. In the last century Greece was the first of the subject

racess of the Balkan peninsula to wrest its freedom from the Turk, and the Greeks at once followed the example of Russia, and set up a church of their own on the Russian model, which they imitated even to the suppression of useless monasteries. This roused the acute dissatisfaction of Constantinople, where the church authorities held that the Greek government and bishops had no right to erect an autokephalous church on their own initiative without the consent of the ecumenical patriarch. Here again Professor Kyriakos approves of the course taken by the free Greeks. He says :

The bishops of a free country have, as representatives of their church, absolute ecclesiastical authority. Therefore in conjunction with the Greek government the Greek bishops had the right to proclaim the ecclesiastical independence of their land.

Nevertheless the authorities at Constantinople would not abate their claims over free Greece. The synod at Athens was to refer debated issues to Stamboul, receive thence the chrism or holy oil of confirmation, and was to be free of all control by the Greek government. In 1852 the Greeks yielded in the matter of the chrism, but renewed the proclamation of their independence in all other respects ; and the patriarch of Stamboul ceased his importunities, though he has never, it seems, formally recognized the existence of the church of free Hellas.

As early as 1740 the orthodox in Austria, who number today about three millions, erected the independent patriarchate of Karlowitz ; but Stamboul ignored its independence until 1884, when Joachim IV. for the first time openly recognized it. It is just as if the archbishop of Canterbury should until today arrogate to himself the right to administer the affairs of the Episcopal church in the United States. There has also been friction with the Servians, who in 1877 restored that old mediæval independence of their church which had been lost only as late as 1766. Toward the Roumanians who in 1856, having achieved national independence, at once proclaimed their ecclesiastical independence as well, there has been shown by the Greek patriarch of Constantinople the bitterest animosity. The Roumanians refuse to seek confirmation at Stamboul of their choice of their own ecclesiastics, to keep the Greek patriarch's name in their prayers and diptychs, and to go to Stamboul for the chrism. In 1873 the Greek patriarch professed himself willing to recognize the church synod erected in Roumania on the Russian model, but adhered to the well-worn claim that the announcement of its independence must be made by himself. The

Roumanians retorted by confiscating the rich revenues which the Greek monasteries of Athos and Sinai drew from lands in Roumania, and by displacing all priests and schoolmasters who knew Greek but did not know Roumanian. However, there is an eastern proverb which advises us to make friends, not with our very next neighbor, but with our next but one; and in 1884 the patriarch of Constantinople, Joachim IV., took this advice and healed his quarrel with the Roumanians,³ for the Bulgarians, who lay much nearer home, and were far from friendly with the Roumanians, had with the advent of their freedom from the Porte preferred and established the same claims to the independence of their national church as the other nations we have enumerated. The pages in which Professor Kyriakos relates the progress of what he is pleased to call the Bulgarian schism, are full of bias; and, if Gibbon were alive in our day, would justify many an additional gibe at the Christian religion. It is known that the Greek monks of Athos, in order to obliterate the memory of the ancient Bulgarian church, which even Professor Kyriakos admits to have possessed "a certain independence," destroyed, early in the nineteenth century, hundreds of ancient manuscripts in the Old-Bulgarian tongue preserved in their convents. In 1860 the Bulgarians, among other signs of a reviving national spirit, began to purge their churches and schools of priests and teachers who were Greek and Greek alone. Writes Professor Kyriakos:

In 1860 the Bulgarians, who sometimes went with Russia, sometimes with the Latin propaganda (Russia had in view the strengthening and diffusion of Slav influence in Thrace and Macedonia), began to work, not only for the recovery of the ancient rights of their church, but for the full ecclesiastical independence of all the Bulgarians disseminated over European Turkey. They made many complaints to the patriarchs of Constantinople about the sending of Greek bishops and clergy into purely Bulgarian districts and of the oppressions to which they were subjected by the Greek clergy.

Hopeless of justice at the hands of the Greeks, a Bulgarian bishop, Joseph, opened negotiations with Rome, and in Macedonia a small party of Bulgarians under the bishop Nilos became uniats. Professor Kyriakos admits that "the Bulgarians saw through the designs of the Latin propaganda and, energetically repudiating them, remained in all essentials true to the Orthodox faith" (p. 42). Yet he has not a word of blame for the suicidal folly and selfishness of the Greek authorities which drove the Bulgarians into such courses. For no alternative was really left to the Bulgarians but to follow the example of Roumania and

³ In 1897 it broke out afresh.

of Hellas, and to set up, or rather restore, their own national church. On February 27, 1870, the Porte issued a firman recognizing the independent existence of their church, both in Bulgaria and in certain regions of Thrace and Macedonia, where at least a third of the population was Bulgarian. What could be fairer? The Greek patriarch, however, refused to recognize this firman as being a contravention of the eighth canon of Nice and of the thirty-first apostolic canon! He also summoned an ecumenic council to deal with the matter, but the Russian and Servian churches very properly ignored the summons. In 1872 a Bulgarian exarchate was established in Stamboul to represent the interests of the Bulgarian church at the Porte; and Anthimos, bishop of Widdin, was chosen to fill the post. Thereupon the Greek patriarch excommunicated Anthimos and all who recognized him as schismatics, and formally condemned the intrusion into church organization of the principle of nationality, as opposed to the ancient canons of the church. This was a thoroughly hypocritical plea, which the Greeks do not dare to advance against the Russian, Servian, and Roumanian churches, under the same circumstances. The Russians, however, have remained in communion with the Bulgarians, and induced the Greek patriarch of Jerusalem, who leans on them, to recognize the newly constituted church. He was, for doing so, deposed by the Greeks in November, 1872, and one Prokopius substituted for him. But in 1875 the Russian government, undismayed by Byzantine writs of excommunication, went to work and got rid in their turn of Prokopius. The Bulgarians have persevered, and as recently as 1896 secured five bishoprics in Macedonia in regions where they predominate. "The energetic opposition of our people," observes Professor Kyriakos, with complacency, "hindered for a long time the success of their efforts." In 1897 the Greek patriarch Anthimos VII., by way of protest, resigned—a favorite and futile expedient of eastern prelates who cannot get their way with the Turk. In this quarrel our sympathies are with the Bulgarians. Their church was autonomous a thousand years ago, and possesses a rich and extensive ancient literature of its own. Reasonable concessions would have kept them loyal to the Greek patriarch, who, if he had possessed any charity, nay any common-sense, would have of his own initiative abstained from thrusting on them Greek priests and schoolmasters; as if the attempt to Hellenize an ancient Slav people with traditions and culture of its own could possibly succeed.

I have narrated, chiefly from the pages of Professor Kyriakos

this episode so fully, because it explains in a measure what is now going on in European Turkey. When the modern Greeks recently went to war with the Turks, it was in the wild hope of getting Macedonia for themselves ; and that was why the Macedonians, who are mainly of Bulgarian stock, held aloof from their cause, and even aided the Turks. Just now, when a struggle of the Macedonians with their Turkish oppressors impends, the chief abettors of the Turk are the Greeks, of whom everyone aspires to play the rôle of a *Bulgaro-klonos*.

From the professions of liberalism and progress poured out in the pages of Athenian journals, one would suppose that there was freedom of religious thought and expression in modern Hellas, and that the church there was more tolerant than, for example, in Russia, but from the pages of Professor Kyriakos it does not appear to be so. Under the head of "fanatics" he briefly sketches two recent religious movements, one of them evidently of deep interest. The first of these movements began in 1856 and was led by a monk named Papulakis, who preached "repentance and a return to the old usages of the Fathers." He seems to have resembled a Russian old believer. His followers, numerous in the district of Maina, were put down by armed force, and he himself was banished to a convent in Andros, where he shortly afterward died. The other movement is that of a highly cultured layman named Makrakis, who, according to our author, held himself to be a legate of God, directly inspired by the *Logos*, and proclaimed himself a son of Mary and a brother of Christ. The state was a creation of Satan, he said, herein agreeing with Paul, who in 1 Cor. 15 : 24 regards all rule and all authority and power as, with the exception of death, the last enemy to be abolished by Christ at his second coming. Makrakis was a patriotic visionary and believed that the Lord's mother in a vision had marked him out as the liberator of Byzantium from the Turk. He taught also that the immortal spirit in man is divine and is sent into men at baptism ; that Christ, as touching his spiritual nature was first made perfect in baptism, when he received his immortal spirit. Makrakis founded a church of his own in which they receive the sacrament without previous fasting, and confession of sins is made in public, women confessing to women. In 1879, at the instance of the holy synod, Makrakis was prosecuted for violating the established religion and founding a new sect. His school was broken up and his churches closed. He himself was cast into prison. He escaped and continued his propaganda, especially against simony. Many of the orthodox clergy favored him, and his adherents

still number 5,000. Such is the fate of a religious reformer in modern Greece. One would like to know whence he drew his inspiration, and whether it was by accident that he blundered into so old a stratum of Christian teaching, for we can discern through the mists of spiteful exaggeration that his teaching exactly agrees with that ascribed to the Ebionites and to Theodotus of Rome by Hippolytus in his *Philosophumena*, Book VII, chap. 34. A not very dissimilar form of Adoptionist doctrine still survives among the dissenters of Russia and of Armenia, and I suspect that Makrakis had come into contact with them.

In spite, however, of the prejudices natural in a divine of the orthodox church, Professor Kyriakos has written a valuable and instructive book, which deserves to be translated into English, and which anyhow all must read who would understand the Christianity of the modern Greeks, and learn what are its aspirations and what the traditions it most cherishes. Of particular interest are the pages in which the Musulman treatment of the Christian Rayah is described. When one reads of the long martyrdom which the Greeks have undergone in behalf of their faith, ever threatened on the one side by the bribes the Sultans could offer to apostates, and on the other by the insidious propaganda of the Jesuits, one is disposed to pardon the occasional bitterness with which Professor Kyriakos speaks both of Mohammedan and of Latin. And if it is difficult to sympathize with the hatred of the modern Greek for the Slav, it is easy to understand it. Our author sees quite clearly that Russia, under the pretense of protecting oriental Christendom, merely aims at her own aggrandizement. Thus, on p. 265 he tells in brief the history of the Armenian massacres of 1895-6, and says that this Mohammedan persecution at the end of the nineteenth century exceeds in inhumanity and ferocity all the persecutions of the religion which there have been since it was founded. He adds that

Russia, who on other occasions is in such a hurry to figure as the protectress of Christians, showed herself absolutely indifferent and callous to these frightful crimes committed at her door; nay, even went so far as to support and uphold the Turks who were threatened from other quarters.

For a reunion with the Armenians Professor Kyriakos breathes pious aspirations. He minimizes the differences between himself and them, and dwells on the friendliness which marks their relations with the Greek churches all over Turkey. He is mistaken, however, in supposing that the Armenians will ever lie down in the same fold with the Russian Orthodox, for they have the example of the ancient Georgian

church before their eyes. The old Georgian liturgies have been thrust half-way down the Georgian churches and Russian substituted at the altar; Russian nuns are constituted the guardians of their dearest shrines, and their entire church economy is placed under the heel of the holy synod of St. Petersburg and of the Tsar's procurator.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

OXFORD, ENGLAND.

A STATESMAN OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

ONE would not go far outside the facts, if he said that Hooker's work¹ and the study of it mark the turning-points in the history of the English church. Born in 1553-4, dying in 1600, his life is practically coterminous with the Elizabethan age, and his book is its one enduring achievement in the field of the religious reason. The publication of the *Polity* by Keble was a significant literary symptom of the Oxford movement. And it is evident that the present crisis in the Church of England is leading to a renewal of interest. The fifth book was republished by Bishop Paget in 1898. This with the edition before us gives evidence of an increasing attention to Hooker's principles.

It is a pity that the fifth book should be thus isolated. The first book, published by Church in 1882, submits to such treatment without material loss. As a study of the idea of Law, deep in thought, sustained in dignity and noble in style, it may well be taken as an English classic. But the fifth book, if taken by itself, is bound to suffer serious loss. And in our generation, with its multitudinous books and the well-nigh resistless institutional pressure upon the average minister's time, when thus printed, it is pretty sure to be read more or less by itself, both by the gentle and by the hardened reader. It may be said, however, that the study of the fifth book by itself is a special need of the English church in our time. If the establishment is to be maintained, Hooker's method of dealing with the sacraments and with the questions of ritual must prevail. His spirit of comprehensiveness, his intellectual temper must continue to be the dominating element within the Anglican church if she is to abide in her present high position.

This edition has a great deal to commend it. Being the first in the series of handbooks entitled "The English Theological Library,"

¹*Ecclesiastical Polity*. Fifth Book. By RICHARD HOOKER. Edited by RONALD BAYNE, M.A. New York: Macmillan, 1902. Pp. cxxiv + 738.